



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,568	03/29/2004	Naoki Kitagaki	119288	1225
25944	7590	10/03/2006	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320				HUBER, PAUL W
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2627

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/810,568	KITAGAKI ET AL.
	Examiner Paul Huber	Art Unit 2627

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 and 11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2,3,5,7 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ .                         |

Art Unit: 2627

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claims 1 and 4 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of copending Application No. 11/176,325. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because: as noted by the Federal Circuit in *Eli Lilly v. Barr*, “[a] patentable distinction does not lie where a later claim is anticipated by an earlier one” (see also *In re Berg* and *In re Goodman* which established that a later genus claim limitation is anticipated by, and therefore not patentably distinct from, an earlier species claim); and/or it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to perform the method claims of recording data, the motivation being to produce the optical data storage medium of the copending claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura (USP-5,905,695).

Art Unit: 2627

Kimura discloses an information-recording medium for recording and reproducing information thereon. The information-recording medium including an information recording portion on which the information is recorded by being irradiated with a light beam having a recording power  $P_w$  (claimed 'P<sub>p</sub>') and an erasing power  $P_L$  (claimed 'P<sub>b</sub>'), and on which the information is reproduced by being irradiated with a light beam having a reproducing power  $P_r$  which must be lower than the recording power  $P_w$  and the erasing power  $P_L$  so as not to damage the recorded information upon reproduction.

The information recording medium further includes a control data portion (see col. 10, lines 49-64), wherein information (initial value of  $P_L$ ) is previously recorded for determining an optimum erasing power  $P_L$  from a minimum erasing power  $P_{Lmin}$  (claimed 'P<sub>b1</sub>') and a maximum erasing power  $P_{Hth}$  (claimed 'P<sub>b2</sub>'). See also figures 7-9B, and col. 10, line 31, through col. 12, line 48. The [optimum erasing] value  $P_L$  is assumed to be an intermediate value between  $P_{Lmin}$  and  $P_{Hth}$  ... and is obtained by  $(P_{Lmin} + P_{Hth})/2$ " (col. 12, lines 18-21). As shown by figures 7 & 8, the following relationships are satisfied:  $P_r < P_{Lmin}$  (claimed 'P<sub>b1</sub>') <  $P_L$  (claimed 'P<sub>b</sub>'); and  $P_L$  (claimed 'P<sub>b</sub>') <  $P_{Hth}$  (claimed 'P<sub>b2</sub>') <  $P_w$  (P<sub>H1</sub>, P<sub>H2</sub>, claimed 'P<sub>p</sub>).

Claims 1 and 4 would be allowed if a terminal disclaimer is timely filed as explained above.

Claims 2, 3, 5, 7 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Noda discloses a phase change optical information recording medium.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Paul Huber at telephone number 571-272-7588.



Paul Huber  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2627

pwh  
September 28, 2006